

S/N 09/976,871
Docket DAV01-001
Reply to Advisory action dated 07-06-2004

Page 6

REMARKS

Examiner Fenn Mathew is thanked for the thorough Advisory Action and for expediting the advisory action.

The applicant's "Response to final Office action dated Feb 11, 2004" was filed on March 22, 2004. It was discovered that the applicant's response to the final office action was not properly docketed in the PTO electronic system. On PAIRS the applicant's response appeared to received by the PTO on 3/22/04, but it was not added to the examiner's docket~6/29. The Advisory action was mailed on 7/6/04. The mis-docketing in the PTO electronic system caused the delay in issuing the advisory action.

Applicant respectfully requests the PTO to waive any fees or penalties caused by the delayed advisory action.

In the Claims

All rejected claims are canceled.

New claims 74 and 75 are added. Parent claim 74 is objected to claim 56 rewritten to include the limitation of any intervening claims. The claims were amended with respect to the last entered "response to office action" dated 2/11/04.

Dependent claim 75 contains the limitation of objected to claim 57 rewritten to include the limitation of any intervening claims less the limitations already in parent claim 74 from claim 56.

The claims are amended as shown above. No new matter is added.

The amendments put the case in condition for allowance.

S/N 09/976,871
Docket DAV01-001
Reply to Advisory action dated 07-06-2004

Page 7

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Rejection of claims 53, 58-59 and 64-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schweitzer '356

The rejection of claims 53, 58-59 and 64-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schweitzer '356 is acknowledged.

The rejected claims are canceled. The claims are canceled to expedite processing of this case and not due to the prior art. This is not a FESTO estoppel and not related to patentability.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schweitzer.

The rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schweitzer is acknowledged.

Claim 54 is canceled. The claim is canceled to expedite processing of this case and not due to the prior art. This is not a FESTO estoppel and not related to patentability.

S/N 09/976,871
Docket DAV01-001
Reply to Advisory action dated 07-06-2004

Page 8

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. Issuance of the application is requested.

It is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (215) 670-2455 should there be anyway that we could help to place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Stoffel 7/22/04

William J. Stoffel Reg. No. 39,390

William J. Stoffel
Reg no. 39,390
Customer no. 30,402

1735 Market St - Ste A
PMB 455
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-670-2455

Computer file info: DAV01-001- ROA5 to adv action dated 2004-07-22 - claims from roa3 (entered).DOC file size: 52736

- END OF FAX -